

**Section 3, Remarks and Response to Rejection:****REMARKS**

Applicants submit herewith a Corrected Section 2 for the Response to Office Action previously timely submitted on July 2, 2004 (in response to the Office Action of March 2, 2004). This correction is submitted pursuant to a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated August 6, 2004.

In the Response of July 2, 2004, Applicants submitted the claims in order of dependency. The PTO doesn't like that and wants them in their numerical order. When undersigned counsel was an Examiner, it was strongly preferred that the amendments list the claims in order of dependency for ease of examination.

However, going with the current rules flow, Applicants' undersigned counsel being duly chastised, resubmits a Corrected Section 2 with the claims in numerical sequence.


Please see the original Response of July 2, 2004 for the Remarks section in which it is pointed out that the claims are patentable over the references cited. Those Remarks are hereby incorporated by reference, and not repeated here since the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment only requires Applicants "to supply the corrected section", and to not overburden the record.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully urged that the case is now in complete condition for allowance and prompt disposition is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jacques M. Dulin  
Ralf Seip

Date: September 2, 2004

by:   
Jacques M. Dulin, Reg. No. 24,067  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

***Innovation Law Group, Ltd.***  
***Transforming Ideas Into Business Assets®***  
***224 W. Washington Street***  
***NetPort Center, Suite 201***  
***Sequim, WA 98382-3652***  
***Phone 360 681 - 7305***  
***Fax 360 681 - 7315***

***e-mail: Dulin@InnovationLaw.com***